

Amendments to the Drawings

Filed herewith is a replacement drawing sheet for Fig. 1. It is respectfully requested that the replacement drawing sheet be substituted for the originally filed drawing sheet for Fig. 1.

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office action mailed March 15, 2006. Currently, claims 1-41 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, 16-17, 19, 21, 27-29, 32, 38-39, 41, 49 and cancelled claims 4, 15, 31 and 40. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1- 3, 5 – 14, 16 – 30, 32 – 39 and 41-49.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

The drawings were objected to for lack of showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Claims 26-30, 36 and 38-40 were objected to because of containing informalities.

Claims 1, 12, 32-34, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Saeki et al.* (US 6,028,755).

Claims 2, 13, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saeki*.

Claims 3, 14, 35, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saeki*.

Claims 21-23, 27, 41-43, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saeki* in combination with *Kobayashi* (US 5,327,388) or *Estakhri et al.* (US 5,818,781).

Claims 24 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saeki* in combination with *Kobayashi* or *Estakhri* as applied to claims 24 and 28.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saeki* in combination with *Kobayashi* or *Estakhri* as applied to claims 21 and 24.

Claims 44-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Saeki* in combination with *Kobayashi* or *Estakhri* as applied to claim 42.

II. Summary of the Amendments

Claims 1, 12, 16-17, 19, 21, 27-29, 32, 38-39, 41, and 49 have been amended herein. Claims 4, 15, 31 and 40 have been cancelled.

III. Remarks

Objection to the Drawings

Submitted herewith is a proposed drawing correction page with amendments to Figure 1 outlined in red. Also submitted herewith is a replacement sheet which includes all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet. The addition of the replacement sheet we rendered the objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.183(a) moot. It is respectfully submitted no new matter is added by the respective drawing sheet showing, respectively, a PC card, a Compaq fast card, a secure digital card, a smart media card, and a memory stick.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 26-30, 36, and 38-40 were objected to because of various informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the correction of the dependencies and amendments made to intervene amendment claims corrects any informalities noted by the examiner with respect to the aforementioned claims. Removal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a)

Claim 1 has been amended to call for an “output device protection circuit ... including a gate-source protection component.” This limitation was originally present in Claim 4 of the Application as pending prior to the outstanding Office Action.

The examiner had indicated that Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 originally depended from Claim 2. Claim 2 called for “the output regulation device” to comprise a “p-channel

transistor”. The examiner stated, that with respect to Claim 2, “Official notice is taken that the utilization of either a p-channel transistor or a n-channel transistor as a regulation device were both equally old and known expedience in the art at the time of the invention”. Hence, by the examiners own admission, the limitations required in Claim 2 add nothing to the patentability of Claim 4.

Because the limitations of Claim 4, indicated to be allowable by the examiner, have been incorporated into Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, and Claims 2, 3, 5 through 11, dependent from Claim 1, are therefore allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to define:

...the output device protection circuit including a gate hold-down circuit limiting the voltage of the gate until the regulator output reaches a minimum voltage.

This limitation originally appeared in Claim 15 which was indicated by the examiner to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 15 originally depended from Claim 12. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that based on the examiner’s admitted allowability of Claim 15, Claim 12 is now allowable and Claims 13, 14, 16 through 20 are likewise allowable as being dependant on independent Claim 12.

Claim 21 has been amended to define “a protection circuit ... including a gate hold-down circuit limiting the voltage of a gate of the output device until the regular output reaches a minimum voltage”. This limitation added to Claim 21 was originally present in Claim 31. Claim 31 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 31 originally depended from Claim 21. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 21 is now allowable and Claims 22 through 30 are likewise allowable as being dependent upon independent Claim 21.

Claim 32 defines a method which now includes the step of “controlling the gate voltage ...

by limiting the gate voltage until the regular output reaches a minimum voltage”. This limitation added to Claim 32 originally was present in Claim 40. The examiner indicated Claim 40 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome any intervening objections to the claims, addressed above, and to include all limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 40 was originally dependent upon Claim 32, and hence it is respectfully submitted Claim 32 and dependent Claims 33 through 39 are now allowable.

Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Sieki, et al.* in combination with *Kobayashi* or *Estakhri, et al.* Claim 41 has been amended to define an output device protection circuit “including a gate-source protection component”. The limitations of Claim 41 are similar to those set forth above with respect to Claim 1. For the reasons set forth above for Claim 1, and given the fact that the examiner has admitted that the limitations of Claim 4 would render Claim 1 allowable, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 41 as amended, and Claims 42 through 48 dependent therefrom, are now allowable.

Claim 49 has been amended to define “a voltage regulator including ... an output device protection circuit ... including a gate-source protection component”. For the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 41 and Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 49 is now allowable over the cited art of record.

For the reasons set forth above it is respectfully submitted that all of the current pending claims are allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of Claims 1-41 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner’s prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, September 14, 2006..

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 14, 2006

By: /Larry E. Vierra/
Larry E. Vierra
Reg. No. 33,809

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105-2871
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665